Auke Bay Corridor Reconnaissance Study
Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #2
Wednesday, January 8, 2003
7:00 to 9:00 p.m.
Chapel By the Lake, Smith Hall

NOTES

(Note: CAC Member comments and questions *underlined and italicized*)

CAC Members present:

Nancy Lehnhart
Tom Satre
Keith Kelton
Richard Rountree
Eric Twelker
Ron Flint
Ron Klaudt
Bill Cole
Steve Ignell
Don Reid
David Newton
Dick Deems
Pepper McCallon
Gary Jenkins
Paul Kraft

Members of the public in attendance:
Bob Millard
Chip Morris
Nathan Bishop, CBJ Community Development Department

Project Staff present:

DOT&PF Southeast Region
Chris Morrow, P.E., Preliminary Design Group Chief
Michael Lukshin, P.E., Regional Traffic Engineer, Project Manager

USKH, Inc.
Lance Mearig, P.E., Project Manager
Julianne Hanson, P.E., Meeting Facilitator
Dustin Johnson, Staff Engineer

Kinney Engineering
Randy Kinney, P.E., Traffic Engineer

7:05pm **Introduction and Welcome** – Julianne Hanson

Summary of last meeting with a description of the objectives.

Chris Morrow introduced Mike Lukshin to the CAC and explained that Mike would be taking over the project management responsibilities for him for the Auke Bay Corridor Study.

Goals and Objectives Ranking Exercise

A questionnaire containing several goals and objectives that were discussed in the previous meeting was given to the CAC members. Members ranked each objective on how important they felt it was to the project. The questionnaires would be tallied and the results would be presented later in the meeting.

7:16pm **Condition and Needs Assessment**

Collision Data – Randy Kinney

Sixty-seven accidents have occurred in the study area from 1996 to 2000. A possible geometric solution is to flatten curves (larger radii).
If the curves are flattened could speeds increase in those areas?

Intersection Conflict Analysis – Randy Kinney

Conflict studies are used to verify collision potential at locations where accident history isn't conclusive.
Drivers turning left out of Fritz Cove Road (FCR) are currently patient but as volumes pick up they may become impatient and conflicts could increase.

The city bus pullout hinders sight distance with the FCR intersection.

Origin Destination Study

Traffic patterns were observed during morning and evening commuting hours.
It would be useful to know the traffic patterns of the pedestrians in the Auke Bay area.

Geometric Analysis – Lance Mearig

The following geometric elements were evaluated for compliance with current design standards:
–Highway curvature
–Highway grades
–Cross section (lane/shoulder/sidewalk width)

–Intersection sight distance

The beginning of project (BOP) needs to extend back to Engineers Cutoff Road. Chris Morrow said that Planning set the limits but some alternatives may extend the project limits.

This study must address the current and future traffic volumes. Traffic volumes fluctuate drastically with the seasons in Auke Bay. What is the variance from school traffic in the fall versus the boat traffic that occurs in the summer?

Concern was raised over the design speed in the area of the school and post office. 40 mph is too fast for that area.

Currently pedestrians and bicyclists already use their own paths and the paths are not always the sidewalks. The only crosswalk within the whole project is by the school. Future plans need to include pedestrian crosswalks at locations people want to cross (near the college). Bicycle traffic often do not stop when coming down the (Backloop) hill.

Traffic Forecasts – Randy Kinney

Future forecasted traffic volumes will help dictate what type of design suits Auke Bay the best.

UAS intends to close the south UAS entrance to all but delivery traffic. This will drastically change the traffic patterns at that intersection and increase traffic at the Y intersection.

Is there a definite relationship between volume versus risk (safety)? How does the season affect accidents? The data shows that there are more accidents in the winter.

What is the ideal capacity of a two lane road? Randy Kinney answered: The capacity varies greatly depending on character of the road (rural versus urban). The number of intersections and driveways affects capacity.

It was requested for the next meeting a map displaying right of way so people can get an idea of where the right of way is and give them a chance to review the information. People would also like to see who owns what land within the corridor.

8:23pm **Break**

8:34pm **Discussion of Goals and Objectives Ranking Exercise** – Julianne Hanson

The results from the Goals and Objectives Ranking Exercise was shared with the CAC (See summary of results). Members were most concerned with safety and

meeting current design standards. Members were least concerned with the boat trailer problem. The question regarding being consistent with existing and future land use plans had the highest standard deviation, which may indicate that this objective is confusing.

Concerned was raised about the future land use plans because people own a lot of land along the Corridor.

We should not get hung up on zoning but on the actual land use patterns. It was also said that objective 3-4 (future land use plans) was too vague. Its hard to know what the statement means.

The boat trailer issue shouldn't be overlooked. It isn't possible to fix everything in finding the best solution.

About 10 percent of the people who work at the fish lab have been involved in an accident. The majority of these accidents are rear-ends when somebody is turning into the fish lab and the accidents often go unreported.

It may be a better approach if the money spent on this project were spent on the problem areas like the fish lab turning lane and the "Y" intersection and leave the good areas alone. This would concentrate funds for the problem areas and prevent wasting money in areas that currently work fine.

It may be interesting to see how scores may change over the course of the project as more information becomes available. It may be beneficial to group some of these objectives together.

8:49pm **Public comment**

Bob Millard had no comment. He was there on behalf of Chapel by the Lake and is interested in alternatives that impact the Chapel.

Chip Morris stated that the design should not be driven by what people want to drive. Safety and data gathered today is pushing DOT to use the 85th percentile speed which would mean a by-pass. There are only two bypass routes, so Chip will also save his comments until there are some alternatives.

Nathan Bishop- CBJ Planner was in attendance for the second half of the meeting. At the conclusion of the meeting Nathan said they should protect land use patterns. Nathan also mentioned he couldn't find the meeting site and requested the next meeting be posted better.

Future CAC meetings and Involvement- Julianne Hanson

The next CAC meeting will be April 1st at the Chapel by the Lake in the Smith Hall (same place).

There will also be a public meeting on April 3rd also in Smith Hall at the Chapel by the Lake.